

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR
WRIT PETITION NO. 404 /2006

Single Bench

PETITIONER

RAMSUDIN SAHU

S/o Shri Ganpatram Sahu,
 Aged about 37 years,
 Occupation, Patwari Resident of,
 Village Mainpur
 Tahsil, Ambikapur,
 District Sarguja (C.G.)

-VERSUS-

RESPONDENTS

1. **State of Chhattisgarh**
 Through the Secretary,
 Department of Revenue, D.K.S.
 Bhavan, Mantralya
 Raipur.(C.G.)
2. **The Collector- Sarguja,**
 Land Record, Collectorate
 Ambikapur, Sarguja (C.G.)
3. **Sub- Divisional Officer**
 Revenue, Ambikapur.
 District. Sarguja
4. **Nayab Tahsildar**
 Darima Circle Ambikapur.
5. **Pannelal Sonwani**
 Patwari, Posted at Halka No. 39,
 Tahsil office Ambikapur District
 Sarguja (C.G.)
6. **Ramvilas manikpuri S/o**
 Chamruram manikpuri, Age, not
 known, R/O Maniour (Mathpara)
 Ambikapur .Diatt. Sarguja.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE
NATURE OF CERTIORARI MANDAMUS ETC AND FOR
APPROPRIATE ORDER/ ORDETS, DIRECTION/ DIRECTIONS.

P.R. No. 404/06
 Presented by B.L. Sahu
 Date 23/11/06
RECEIVED COPY
 23-11-06
 CLE TO A.G. BILASUR

[Signature]
Prashant Tiwari

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक
W.P.No. 404/06
मामला क्रमांक सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	24-1-2006 Shri Avinash K. Mishra, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Satish Gupta, Deputy Government Advocate for respondents No.1 to 4/State. Heard. By this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution, the petitioner has challenged the order, Annexure P-1. The impugned order, Annexure P-1, was passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer on a complaint made by Ramvilas Manikpuri that the petitioner's son is involved in kidnapping and murder of his son. The petitioner's son had kidnapped the son of complainant Ramvilas Manikpuri and demanded a ransom of Rs.5 Lakhs and thereafter committed murder of the son of the complainant. The case is going on and the petitioner is threatening the complainant. The reply of the petitioner was called for. He submitted reply and thereafter the impugned order Annexure P-1 has been passed. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the fact that the petitioner's son is being prosecuted. By way of the impugned order, the Sub-Divisional Officer has changed the work of the petitioner from Patwari Haika No.16 to Patwari Haika No.39. Really, nothing has been done under the facts and circumstances. The impugned order has been passed in the exigency and for the administrative convenience keeping in view the administration of justice. Having considered, I am of the opinion that, this is not a fit case for interference. No one ~~should~~ be allowed to interfere in the administration of justice. The writ petition fails and is dismissed. Consequently, M.(W.)P.No.322/2006 stands dismissed.	

Sd/-
Fakhruddin
Judge

G. Singh
3-1-06
20-4-06